UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,123	05/31/2001	Graham V. Poor	ORTV.P005	1690

53186 7590 02/23/2006

COURTNEY STANIFORD & GREGORY LLP
P.O. BOX 9686
SAN JOSE, CA 95157

EXAMINER	
BONSHOCK, DENNIS G	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2173	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/873,123	POOR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis G. Bonshock	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 November 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 15-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 15-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Non-Final Rejection

Response to Amendment

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed on record in the file: Amendment as received on 11-30-2005.

2. Applicant should note that Poor is listed as the primary inventor, and for future correspondence please refer to the inventors as Poor et al. instead of Mahoney, et al.

3. Claims 1-25 have been examined.

Status of Claims:

4. Claims 1-4, 15-18, 21, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maes et al., patent #6,442,251, hereinafter Maes.

5. Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maes.

6. Claims 5, 6, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maes and Nomura et al., patent # 6,658,409, hereinafter Nomura.

7. Claims 7-14 have been canceled by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-4, 15-18, 21, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maes et al., patent #6,442,251, hereinafter Maes.

10. With regard to claim 1, which teaches a method for controlling screens in an electronic device having a display and a plurality of application programs, each application program having associated with it a plurality of screens, Maes teaches, in column 4, lines 11-20, column 3, lines 62-65, and in column 7, lines 28-41, the each of the plurality of applications having a plurality of screens associated with them. With regard to claim 1, further teaching establishing a link between a user interface control of the device and commands in the application programs using a control file coupled to a software bus, detecting at the software bus user activation, Maes teaches, in column 4, lines 30-51, a link between phone application and subprograms (which as shown in column 4, lines 19-21, can be stand alone program) coupled to a system bus along with the User Interface control of the device, where a user input mechanism is further connected to the bus, for entering commands via hard buttons or a touch-screen. With regard to claim 1, further teaching the application programs comprising application programs that are not native to the device, Maes teaches, in column 4, lines 18-23, an embodiment where the applications are complied and then downloaded to the Palm™ (showing that they are not resident programs). With regard to claim 1, further teaching the control file being editable to configure the link, Maes teaches, in column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 3 and in figure 15, the user editing the arrangement of the keys on the touch panel, which changes the association of a particular area of the touch

panel and the associated link to an action and further teaches the storing of this subprogram for dialer screen related operations in the memory device 320 (see column 4, lines 10-18). With regard to claim 1, further teaching detecting user activation of a user interface control represented on the display, the display displaying a representation of a first screen, the representation of the first screen included in one of the plurality of screens, Maes teaches, in column 1, line 65 through column 2, line 10, the activation of a button displayed on a Palm type computer, the button associated with a command to display the note taking application. With regard to claim 1, further teaching matching a command to the activation of the user interface control associated with the command in response to an indication of the command listed in a control file with indications of the plurality of commands, Maes teaches, in column 2, lines 17-22 and column 7, lines 28-41, the matching of commands (open the note application) with user interface controls (selection of the note button). With regard to claim 1, further teaching on of the plurality of object methods, each associated with one and only one of the plurality of commands, responding to a match between the command listed in the control file and the activation of the user interface control, Maes teaches, in column 4, lines 20-26 and column 1, line 65 through column 2, line 10, the use of Java for implementing the programs, where Java is known in the art, and further disclosed in page 8 of the applications specification, to be an object oriented programming language, where the programs would provide different object methods for each command upon activation. With regard to claim 1, which further teaches starting execution of a second application program in response to a command of at least one or the control file and the software bus, Maes

teaches, in column 4, line 60 through column 5, line 18, a second application program (note taking application) being executed in response to a user command (taping the note key) provided in the first application program (phone application). With regard to claim 1, which further teaches changing the display from displaying a representation of the first screen to displaying a representation of a second screen in response to the object method, Maes teaches, in column 2, lines 7-10 and figures 2 and 5, the changing of the screen from the phone based application to the note taking application upon selection of a button.

11. With regard to claims 2 and 16, which teach the object method invoked by the activation of the user interface control of the first screen is included in the second application program, Maes teaches, in column 4, line 60 through column 5, line 18, while the user in the call application (first screen) the user taps a note button which links to an object method which provides the display of a note taking application (second screen).

12. With regard to claims 3 and 17, which teach the object method invoked by activation of the user interface control of the first screen being included in the first application program, Maes teaches, in column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 3, while the user in the call application (first screen) the user taps a input button which links to an object method which provides the display of a second different call application display (second screen).

13. With regard to claims 4 and 18, which teach the file including indications of a plurality of user interface control labels, each associated with one of the indications of

the plurality of commands, and the representation of the user interface control on the display includes one of the plurality of user interface control labels, Maes teaches, in column 7, lines 28-41 and in figure 10, the note application displaying a plurality of control labels each having a command associated with it for providing a different screen.

14. With respect to claim 15, which teaches, a display and a memory for storing the object framework, Maes teaches, in column 4, line 20-39, the use of a display unit and a memory unit for storing the object framework. With regard to claim 15, further teaching at least one of the application programs being not native to the device, Maes teaches, in column 4, lines 18-23, an embodiment where the applications are complied and then downloaded to the Palm™ (showing that they are not resident programs). With regard to claim 15, further teaching the control file being editable to configure the link, Maes teaches, in column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 3 and in figure 15, the user editing the arrangement of the keys on the touch panel, which changes the association of a particular area of the touch panel and the associated link to an action and further teaches the storing of this subprogram for dialer screen related operations in the memory device 320 (see column 4, lines 10-18). With regard to claim 15, which further teaches a method for controlling screens in an electronic device having a display and a plurality of application programs, each application program having associated with it a plurality of screens, Maes teaches, in column 4, lines 11-20, column 3, lines 62-65, and in column 7, lines 28-41, the each of the plurality of applications having a plurality of screens associated with them. With regard to claim 15, further teaching establishing a

link between a user interface control and commands in the application programs using a control file coupled to a software bus, detecting at the software bus user activation, Maes teaches, in column 4, lines 30-51, a link between phone application and subprograms (which as shown in column 4, lines 19-21, can be stand alone program) coupled to a system bus along with the User Interface control of the device, where a user input mechanism is further connected to the bus, for entering commands via hard buttons or a touch-screen. With regard to claim 15, further teaching detecting user activation of a user interface control represented on the display, the display displaying a representation of a first screen, the representation of the first screen included in one of the plurality of screens, Maes teaches, in column 1, line 65 through column 2, line 10, the activation of a button displayed on a Palm type computer, the button associated with a command to display the note taking application. With regard to claim 15, further teaching matching a command to the activation of the user interface control associated with the command in response to an indication of the command listed in a control file with indications of the plurality of commands, Maes teaches, in column 2, lines 17-22 and column 7, lines 28-41, the matching of commands (open the note application) with user interface controls (selection of the note button). With regard to claim 15, further teaching on of the plurality of object methods, each associated with one and only one of the plurality of commands, responding to a match between the command listed in the control file and the activation of the user interface control, Maes teaches, in column 4, lines 20-26 and column 1, line 65 through column 2, line 10, the use of Java for implementing the programs, where Java is known in the art, and further disclosed in

page 8 of the applications specification, to be an object oriented programming language, where the programs would provide different object methods for each command upon activation. With regard to claim 15, which further teaches starting execution of a second application program in response to a command of at least one or the control file and the software bus, Maes teaches, in column 4, line 60 through column 5, line 18, a second application program (note taking application) being executed in response to a user command (taping the note key) provided in the first application program (phone application). With regard to claim 15, which further teaches changing the display from displaying a representation of the first screen to displaying a representation of a second screen in response to the object method, Maes teaches, in column 2, lines 7-10 and figures 2 and 5, the changing of the screen from the phone based application to the note taking application upon selection of a button.

15. With regard to claim 21, which teaches a personal digital assistant size case, and a wireless data communication interface for communicating data with a remote device, Maes teaches, in column 4, lines 20-43 and figure 2, the system being a Palm size device comprising wireless connectivity.

16. With regard to claims 23 and 25, which teach the software bus comprises a plurality of content holders, wherein content of each content holder is associated with a different one of the application programs, wherein the software bus via the content holders invokes execution of an application program as appropriate to an activated user interface control, Maes teaches, in column 4, lines 8-15 and lines 30-51, various data

communication between groups of application data stored in memory over a system bus, that is executable upon user activation of an associated control.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maes.

19. With regard to claims 22 and 24, which teach configuring the control file in accordance with the plurality of application programs, wherein the configuring is performed during at least one of placement of the device in a powered state, initialization of the device, resetting of the device, login events of the device, Maes teaches the plurality of application programs being resident in the phone application (already stored in the device upon startup) and also ones that are downloaded (see column 4, lines 8-30). Maes doesn't specifically state when the configuration of the control file is set, though the user is given the option upon initialization of the programs to reconfigure the arrangement of keys and buttons (see column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Maes before him at the time the invention was made to allow for setting of the control file at both startup and after events that bring in new applications that the

device didn't have prior knowledge of (device initialization). One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the downloaded applications, as in many cases, would generally require a restart, or resetting of the device where new connections between buttons and associated functions would need to be established, above those initialized at startup.

20. Claims 5, 6, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maes and Nomura et al., patent # 6,658,409, hereinafter Nomura.

21. With regard to claims 5 and 19, Maes teaches a small display system which provides applications that allow for selection of buttons in the application program that link to a separate screen either in the same application program or in a second application program (see column 1, line 65 through column 2, line 30). Maes, however, doesn't specifically teach, using bus listeners with corresponding addresses to check for selection of an interface control. Nomura teaches a portable display processing system that allows selection in a particular application to link to a different application (see column 9, lines 35-67 and figures 12, 13, 28, and 29), but further teaches repeatedly determining whether any one of the keys in the key input has being operated (listening) (see column 9, lines 35-40 and figures 12, 13, and 16), and providing addresses that correspond to the currently selected user interface control (see column 9, lines 35-67 and figure 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Maes and Nomura before him at the time the invention was made to modify the display system of Maes to use listeners to determine if a button was pressed. One

would have been motivated to make such a combination because listeners are often used in object-oriented programs, such as Java, to notify the object class of the latest data on the bus.

22. With regard to claims 6 and 20, Maes teaches, in column 4, line 60 through column 5, line 18, while the user in the call application (first screen) the user taps a note button which links to an object method which provides the display of a note taking application (second screen). Maes, however, doesn't teach the use of a bus listener for associating an address with the command for invoking the screen change. Nomura, further teaches, in column 9, lines 35-67 and figure 16, the use of a listener for determining if any of the keys have been selected and associating an address with each item for providing the screen change. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Maes and Nomura before him at the time the invention was made to modify the display system of Maes to use listeners to determine if a button was pressed. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because listeners are often used in object-oriented programs, such as Java, to notify the object class of the latest data on the bus.

Response to Arguments

23. The arguments filed on 11-30-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Reasons set forth below.

24. The applicants' argue that Maes lacks the teaching of the application programs comprising application programs that are not native to the device, and the control file being editable to configure the link.

25. In response the examiner respectfully submits that Maes teaches, in column 4, lines 18-23, an embodiment where the applications are complied and then downloaded to the Palm™ (showing that they are not resident programs). Maes further teaches, in column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 3 and in figure 15, the user editing the arrangement of the keys on the touch panel, which changes the association of a particular area of the touch panel and the associated link to an action. With respect to the applicant contention that a control file even exist, Maes teaches the changing of the configuration of the associations between dialer screen and the touch panel (column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 3 and in figure 15), and further teaches the storing of this subprogram for dialer screen related operations in the memory device 320 (see column 4, lines 10-18).

26. The applicants' argue that Maes does not provide any mechanism for "...resetting the device where new connections between buttons and associated functions would need to be established..."

27. In response the examiner respectfully submits that the applicant teaches in the independent claims a "control file that is editable to configure a link" by a user. The applicant further teaches in claims 22 and 24, the configuration done during at least one of: placement of the device in a powered state, initialization of the device, resetting of

the device, login events of the device. Maes teaches a handheld device used for user interaction where there is an option displayed on the touch screen to change the arrangement (associations with screen positions) of the keys (see column 3, line 60 through column 4, line 3). When the device is in a placed in a powered on, the keys and associated input 1520, will clearly be available to the user to change the linking associations between screen position and key. This will also be the case when a user initializes a new application downloaded to the device.

28. The applicants' argue that the combination of Maes and Nomura does not teach any relationship between a bus listener and an address listed in a control file.

29. In response the examiner respectfully submits that Nomura supplements the stored associations between keys and input areas of Maes (supra) by further teaching repeatedly determining over a bus whether any one of the keys in the key input has being operated (listening) (see column 9, lines 35-40 and figures 1, 12, 13, and 16), and providing addresses that correspond to the currently selected user interface control (see column 9, lines 35-67 and figure 16).

Conclusion

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis G. Bonshock whose telephone number is (571) 272-4047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

31. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

32. Any information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

2-9-06
dgb

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173